



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1912

I. — *Are the Political "Speeches" of Demosthenes to be regarded as Political Pamphlets?*

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES DARWIN ADAMS

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

THE traditional view of the political works of Demosthenes is that they are genuine *δημηγορίαι*, carefully written in advance, delivered from the bema, and then revised and published by the author, or in some cases by his literary executors.¹ I find the first suggestion of a different view in a note by Wilamowitz in vol. II of his *Aristoteles und Athen*, 1893, where (p. 215) he speaks of the *Fourth Philippic* and the speech *On the Letter* as being "allerdings keine Reden, sondern politische Flugschriften." The next year Eduard Schwartz in the course of a discussion of the *First Philippic*² presented in some detail an argument for considering Demosthenes' political speeches, so-called, as political pamphlets. This view has now been fully accepted by Wilamowitz, Eduard Meyer, and Paul Wendland.³

¹ Cf. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, III, i², pp. 74 ff.

² *Demosthenes erste Philippika*, Marburg, 1894.

³ Wilamowitz, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, viii), pp. 73 ff.

Meyer, *Isokrates' zweiter Brief an Philipp und Demosthenes' zweite Philippika*, Berlin, 1909. Cf. *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, Bd. II (1899), p. 384, n. 1.

Wendland, *Isokrates und Demosthenes*, Berlin, 1910, pp. 292 ff.; cf. *Die griechische Prosa* (Gercke und Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Bd. I), p. 348. Cf. his treatment of the *Fourth Philippic* as probably an

The pamphlet theory may be stated as follows: Demosthenes' extant political "speeches," so-called, are not speeches in any real sense. They are political pamphlets, cast in the form of speeches, designed for immediate effect on public opinion. Any one of them may be more or less based on a speech that Demosthenes had actually delivered from the bema; but in any case the published works differ so much from the actual speeches in both form and content that they must be regarded as essentially new works: pamphlets, written for the immediate use of the supporters of Demosthenes. They will have been used chiefly in oral reading before political clubs and groups of citizens. They are pleas, not for a specific question that is before the ecclesia on a given day and hour, but for general policies, on questions that are less ephemeral. While the speech from the bema was undoubtedly Demosthenes' main instrument for influencing public opinion, he did, it is claimed, resort occasionally to the political pamphlet, an instrument which had long since become fully recognized in the field of practical statesmanship. The content of the pamphlet, it is said, may often be the result of the orator's reflection on actual discussion in the ecclesia; he will have reviewed in his mind what had been said there in debate by himself and by others; he will have eliminated the ephemeral, the lesser details, the personalities; he will have selected those points that involved the central issue, and that in debate had proved most effective; these he will have embodied in form more condensed and in language more formal and refined than would have been suited to the bema. These pamphlets are what we have been accustomed to call the political "speeches" of Demosthenes. The real political speeches, in the form in which they were delivered, were not published.

actual speech, in his review of Diels and Schubart's edition of the Didymus Commentary, *Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1906, Bd. II, p. 364.

A review of this theory has been given, and an analysis of the "Speeches" on this basis has been made, in a dissertation by Karl Hahn, *Demosthenis contiones num re vera in contione habitae sint quaeritur*, Giessen, 1910. In a review of Hahn's dissertation, *Berl. philol. Wochenschrift*, 1911, sp. 705, Thalheim argues briefly but decidedly against the pamphlet theory.

It will be seen at once that the pamphlet theory as applied to a given work of Demosthenes may be so held as not to differ materially from the speech theory. One who, for instance, holds that the *First Philippic* is a pamphlet based on a previous discussion in the ecclesia and containing, in general, arguments that Demosthenes had himself presented there, does not differ essentially from one who treats the *First Philippic* as a speech, previously written, and actually delivered by Demosthenes in the ecclesia, but considerably revised after delivery, and immediately published for further effect on public opinion. The more one emphasizes the probable amount of revision for publication and the practical purpose of publication, the more nearly he approaches the position of the pamphlet theory. But, in fact, those who hold the pamphlet theory say little of the possible speech as underlying the published work; both content and form are treated as largely a new creation; while those who treat the works as speeches, usually think of them and speak of them as giving us an essentially correct impression of the speeches actually delivered on specific occasions. In practice therefore the difference between the two schools of interpretation is real and important.

Before discussing the several speeches let me present certain general considerations. It would certainly be surprising to find that in the case of an orator whose activity covered both private and public cases in the courts, and speeches and discussions in the ecclesia, he or his literary executors had taken pains to publish specimens of the legal oratory, both private and public, but had preserved and published nothing from the long series of political speeches in the ecclesia. This would be doubly surprising in view of the fact that Demosthenes' fame and influence in the years of his full maturity rested chiefly upon his great popular speeches. If his speeches in other fields were deemed by himself or others worthy of publication, how could we explain the failure to publish the most characteristic products of his art?

Two answers may be offered. First, it is said that the

publication of *δημηγορίαι* was not a custom of Athenian statesmen; that publication was practically confined to epideictic and legal oratory. It is true that we have no decisive evidence of the publication of any *δημηγορίαι* in the fifth century.¹ In the early fourth century we hear of but one published *δημηγορία*, the extant speech of Andocides *On the Peace* (392/1 B.C.). Even this may be a pamphlet.² In only a very few cases do we learn of *δημηγορίαι* as published by statesmen contemporary with Demosthenes. We hear of nothing of this class published by Eubulus, Phocion, Lycurgus, Aeschines, or Demades. A few of the speeches of Hyperides that are mentioned by ancient writers may have been *δημηγορίαι*; the speech *On Halonnesus* is a *δημηγορία*, probably by Hegesippus. A speech of Philinus cited by Harpocration (*σ.ν. θεωρικά*) was probably a *δημηγορία*. If we view the extant political speeches of Demosthenes as published *δημηγορίαι*, we must admit that they belong to a new and almost unique department of fourth century literature.

The advocates of the pamphlet theory appeal also to the fact that the political pamphlet had become well established before the close of the fifth century, and that the fictitious political speech was one of its recognized departments. Of course the speech-pamphlets of Isocrates represent the highest development of the art hitherto recognized. It is urged then with considerable force that in view of the rarity of publication of *δημηγορίαι*, and the recognized use of speech-pamphlets both as political instruments and works of literary art, the works of Demosthenes in question are presumably pamphlets also.

And yet the argument has less force than at first appears. Consider the circumstances under which the political pamphlet developed, and under which it was at any time useful. It was of use, first, to the man who sought to propagate political doctrines and further political movements that could not be discussed openly. This was doubtless the chief cause

¹ Plato suggests the reason, *Phaedrus*, 257, d.

² Drerup so considers it. [*Ἡρώδου*] *Περὶ Πολιτείας*, Drerup, Paderborn, 1908, p. 112.

of the rapid growth of pamphlet literature in the last quarter of the fifth century. Pamphlets, circulated through the secret political clubs, helped to prepare the way for the oligarchical revolutions of 411 and 404. The political pamphlet was useful, secondly, to the man who for any reason had no access to the bema; metics like Thrasymachus and Lysias might well avail themselves of this means of influencing political events; Isocrates, unfitted by temperament for public speaking,¹ found in the pamphlet-speech an effective instrument for working upon public opinion. A third use was for appeal to the comparatively small reading class, and the presentation to them of arguments that demanded more deliberate thought than could be expected in the ecclesia. A fourth use of the pamphlet might naturally be to influence public opinion in other states.

The last of these uses might seem to have been distinctly called for in the case of Demosthenes. No small part of his effort was given to spreading the anti-Macedonian propaganda in other states. But in all the works that we are discussing we find so much that is distinctively Athenian, the standpoint is always so clearly that of Athens, that it is impossible to consider the influencing of public opinion abroad as the primary purpose of any one of them. Indeed, the fact that we have no work of Demosthenes addressed directly to public opinion in Arcadia or Thebes is of considerable weight as an argument that he did not resort to pamphlet literature at all. It would seem that if he had cared to use it anywhere, it would have been in the foreign field.²

Of the other natural uses of the pamphlet no one applies in the case of Demosthenes. He had the fullest access to the bema, and there he reached practically the whole citizen body whenever public interest was stirred.³ Nor had he any

¹ See Isoc. *Panath.* §§ 10 ff.

² Any such pamphlets circulated abroad would have attained such wide circulation that they could hardly have failed to come down to us.

³ We must be on our guard against assuming modern conditions for Demosthenes. The modern statesman must depend largely on the published word. Demosthenes reached with his voice practically all the citizens who would have taken the trouble to read his speeches or hear them read.

secret views to propagate. He sought reforms, but they were of the sort that could best be brought about by the most public propaganda. Moreover, it was on the bema that Demosthenes was at his best; to the force of his thought was added the tremendous effect of his delivery — in his judgment three parts of eloquence. In the ecclesia in his mature years he had a large and enthusiastic following, ready to accentuate his words by their applause. His power in debate was not through laborious argument, but by direct appeal to sentiment; and he addressed himself not to the select minority of students of politics, but to the mass of the citizens. It is hard to believe that a man who had at his command such effective means for influencing the public should have thought it worth while to resort to the fictitious speech, circulated comparatively slowly, reaching at best only a minority of citizens, and oftentimes marred in its effect by the poor delivery of the man who happened to be reading it aloud in club-room or stoa.¹ The fact is that the pamphlet was essential to Critias, Theramenes, Thrasyarchus, Lysias, Isocrates; but Demosthenes did not need it. All that a pamphlet could do for him among his fellow-citizens — and it was little at best — could be as well done by the publication of speeches that he had actually delivered in the ecclesia. And this publication would not only serve for whatever of political influence might have lain in the pamphlet form, but it would also preserve and circulate Demosthenes' speeches as specimens of rhetorical art.

This remark brings us to the question whether it is probable that Demosthenes would have made such an innovation in the custom of Athenian statesmen as to publish *δημηγορίαι*. It is first to be noted that Demosthenes began his career as a *λογογράφος*, and that like other men of that profession he published specimens of his court speeches. But Demosthenes' court speeches were not all in private cases; some involved political questions; in publishing these, too, he was

¹ If the last difficulty seem trivial, note Isocrates' complaint of the injustice done his works by unintelligent delivery, *Panath.* § 17.

doing no more than Lysias had done.¹ When now Demosthenes began to pass beyond the field of speech-writing for the courts, and to prepare speeches for his own delivery in ecclesia or senate, it would seem that nothing could have been more natural than to publish these speeches also. It is to be remembered, too, that there is strong ground for believing that when Demosthenes began his career on the bema he was not only a λογογράφος, but a teacher of rhetoric as well.² In this capacity he would naturally publish specimens of his rhetorical art as applied to practical statesmanship.

The publication of Demosthenes' δημηγορίαι becomes the more natural when we remember the testimony to his extremely careful preparation of his speeches; they 'smelt of the lamp,' his critics said. The testimony to this is so well known that I need not dwell upon it.³ No one would assume that all Demosthenes' speeches from the bema were prepared in advance; but many were. Why should not some of these have been published as specimens of oratory by a man who was publishing his court speeches on similar themes? The ordinary Athenian statesman did not come into the political field through apprenticeship as λογογράφος and teacher of rhetoric; Demosthenes did. In this difference of personal experience I find in part an explanation of Demosthenes' departure from the custom of his predecessors and his contemporaries in the matter of publication.

I pass now from general presuppositions to the definite arguments for the pamphlet theory. But first it is to be noted that no ancient testimony to the publication of pamphlets by Demosthenes is cited. Aeschines from time to

¹ How far the purpose of such publication was to advertise the professional services of the writer, and how far it was to give to the public and to posterity finished products of the rhetorical art, I would not attempt to determine for either Lysias or Demosthenes.

² For the evidence, see Blass, *Att. Bered.* III, i², p. 35, n. 1. This may account for the fact that we have relatively more published δημηγορίαι from Demosthenes' early period than from his later one. If he published at first as a λογογράφος and teacher of rhetoric, publication would become less frequent as he abandoned these fields. If publication was from the first as pamphleteer, it ought rather to increase in the later years.

³ See especially Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, ix-xi.

time goes pretty deeply into detail in describing Demosthenes' pernicious activity; he never accuses him of writing pamphlets. Dionysius, in the full current of literary tradition, knows nothing of the theory.

The modern critics argue, first, that these speeches do not attach themselves to a definite day, or grow out of a specific subject or motion in the ecclesia, or lead to a definite motion.

This argument fails at the outset to recognize the wide range both of subject and treatment that may be expected at a meeting of the ecclesia. Not all speeches in such a body are called out by specific motions; sometimes the senate refers a subject to the ecclesia for discussion, without definite recommendation of its own; not all speeches in Athens, any more than in Boston or Washington, need be confined to the nominal subject of debate: in times of political excitement almost any subject may lead to a speech on the popular theme; and not every speech need lead to a motion. We should expect that some of the works in question, if they are real speeches, would have these marks; but they cannot be set up as a test for all. Now in fact, of the eleven speeches in question, eight do with sufficient clearness meet this test of definiteness of time, subject, and motion.

The Speech *On the Symmories*. — This is a discussion of the question of avoiding or seeking war with Persia. The occasion is definite and precise; a war is threatened; if the city takes certain action, the war will come. Demosthenes expresses himself clearly but briefly on the question, but makes this the occasion for presenting a scheme of naval reform. In the proem (§ 2) he states that this reform is his real subject: αὐτὸς δὲ πειράσομαι τὸν τρόπον εἰπεῖν ὃν ἂν μοι δοκῇτε μάλιστα δύνασθαι παρασκευάσασθαι. The speech does not look toward a motion to-day establishing this reform, for that would be out of order; it could come only through constitutional amendment; this speech only prepares public sentiment. Had Demosthenes written this speech for pamphlet circulation primarily, there would have been no occasion to attach his scheme of naval reform to an argument against war with Persia; in fact, his view that war should be avoided if possible, gives less support to a policy of naval preparedness than the opposite view. The only possible reason for

combining the two pleas is that the actual discussion in the ecclesia on war with Persia gave Demosthenes his opportunity to get a hearing for his naval proposals.

The Speech For the Megalopolitans.—The occasion is as specific as could be desired. A debate is in progress on proposals brought by ambassadors from Arcadia and Lacedaemonia; Athenian partisans of either side have spoken (§ 1). Demosthenes takes a positive position on the question. There is no occasion for him to make a motion; he is one of numerous speakers; a definite question is already before the ecclesia.

The Speech For the Rhodians.—The occasion is definite. An appeal to help restore the Rhodian democracy is before the ecclesia. Demosthenes supports the appeal: ἐγὼ δὲ δίκαιον μὲν εἶναι νομίζω κατὰγειν τὸν Ῥοδίων δῆμον, § 28.

The First Philippic.—Here Demosthenes is the first speaker, or certainly one of the first (§ 1). He introduces clearly the subject of discussion, the present situation in the war with Philip, and he develops a definite and detailed plan for enabling the city to carry on the campaign more effectively; this includes details as to ships, troops, and funds, and a plan for raising the money (§ 13). He assumes that the people will be called on to vote on these proposals; indeed, he refers to them as already in the form of a motion: ἐπειδὴν δ' ἐπιχειροτονήτε τὰς γνώμας (note the article), ἀν' ὑμῶν ἀρέσκει, χειροτονήσετε, § 30; α' δ' ὑπάρξει δεῖ παρ' ὑμῶν, ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀγὼ γέγραφα, § 33. The Mss. give the heading of his schedule of taxation (§ 29), but the document itself is not preserved. Both occasion and proposed outcome of the *First Philippic* are therefore as definite as could be asked for any speech.

The First Olynthiac.—The occasion is definite: a proposition for sending help to Olynthus is under discussion: ἔστι δὴ τά γ' ἐμοὶ δοκοῦντα, ψηφίσασθαι μὲν ἤδη τὴν βοήθειαν (note the article), § 2. The speech is in support of this proposition. The details would properly be referred to the senate.

The Second and Third Olynthiacs.—There is no reference to a specific proposition, and neither speech looks toward a motion by the speaker. So far as this aspect is concerned, either one of these works might be a pamphlet on the general question of help to Olynthus. But both may as reasonably be regarded as speeches delivered in the course of the months during which this must have been the subject of repeated discussions in the ecclesia.

The Speech *On the Peace*.—The speech is on a definite subject, the acceptance of the act of the Amphictyonic Council in giving a seat to Philip. There is no reference to a specific motion, but there is nothing in the way of the assumption of such a motion. This work could, so far as this aspect is concerned, be treated equally well as a pamphlet or as a speech in a discussion that certainly must have taken place.

The Second Philippic.—The occasion is specific, the discussion of the answer to be given to certain ambassadors (implied in the words καθ' ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ὕστερον βουλευέσθε and ἀποκρινάμενοι, § 28). The speech was accompanied by a draft of the answer proposed by Demosthenes (ἀ δὲ νῦν ἀποκρινάμενοι τὰ δέοντ' ἂν εἴητ' ἐψηφισμένοι, ταῦτ' ἤδη λέξω, § 28). The document itself is not preserved.

The Chersonesitica.—A definite question, the recall of Diophithes, is before the ecclesia. Demosthenes speaks to the question in both its narrower and its wider aspects. The work belongs to a definite day and a specific question.

The Third Philippic.—A discussion of the general situation leads to definite proposals: 1. To prepare ships, funds, and troops, § 70. 2. To send ambassadors to other states to form an anti-Macedonian alliance, § 71. 3. To support the Athenians who are now in the Chersonese, § 73. The speech distinctly implies that a motion to this effect is to follow: τί ποιῶμεν; πάλαι τις ἡδέως ἂν ἴσως ἐρωτήσας κάθηται. ἐγὼ νῆ Δι' ἐρῶ, καὶ γράψω δέ, ὥστ' ἂν βούλησθε χειροτονήσετε, § 70; ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα λέγω, ταῦτα γράφω, § 76.

The examination of these eleven "speeches" has shown that a definite occasion in the ecclesia, involving specific motions either preceding or following the speech in question, is implied in all save the *Second* and *Third Olynthiacs* and the speech *On the Peace*, and that these three would be entirely fitted to occasions that may readily be conjectured from what we know of the course of events.¹

A second objection to the speech theory is that the treatment of the question supposed in each case to be under discussion in the ecclesia is not detailed enough for a real speech. Here, too, the above analysis of the speeches shows

¹ In treating of only eleven speeches I omit the *Fourth Philippic* and the speech Περὶ Συντάξεως; opinion as to the authorship of these two is not sufficiently agreed to permit of their use with the others. I shall discuss the *Fourth Philippic* briefly at a later point in this paper. It is now generally agreed that the speech Πρὸς τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν τὴν Φιλίππου is by Anaximenes.

that the objection is unfounded in the case of all but the three *Olynthiacs* and the *Third Philippic*. Here the treatment is of a general situation, not of detailed measures. Did the Athenian ecclesia in these years have no place for such speeches?

A third objection is that real speeches, arising from debate in the ecclesia, would make more frequent reference to the opposing speakers and their arguments. As to this, it must be remembered that if these are speeches, they are not the off-hand products of *ex tempore* debate, but speeches prepared in advance. In such works we shall expect to find frequent reference to opposing views, but phrased in general terms and with infrequent reference to particular individuals. I have no doubt that in *ex tempore* debate Demosthenes indulged in virulent personalities. It is altogether likely also that his prepared speeches were oftentimes punctuated by off-hand personal attacks called out by what had just been said by his opponents. The depth of resource and the accuracy of aim of Demosthenes' προπηλακισμός in the *Crown Speech* reveal a practised hand. I confess to some surprise at finding nothing of this in the *δημηγορίαι*. I think, however, we may find sufficient explanation in the assumption that these speeches were written in advance, on themes of the highest importance, and that they were intended by their author to stand, when published, as masterpieces of the rhetorical art. Their dignity of form fits their dignity of subject and purpose. Of course it is possible also that some personalities were eliminated in preparing the speeches for publication, although I do not lay much stress upon this. The striking personality in the *Fourth Philippic*, "You had a thief for your father, if he was like you" (§ 73), is the one piece of personal spite in the *Philippics*.

A fourth objection is that the concentration and unity of thought in these works are in contrast to the loose and accidental arrangement of speeches shaped in debate. But we must remember that the older hypothesis is that these speeches were not shaped in debate, but were the product of the most careful writing. The same consideration explains

the fact that these works show an almost invariably dignified vocabulary, and a style constantly tending to the rounded period. Schwartz, Wilamowitz, and Wendland argue that this is not the style that we have a right to expect in Demosthenes' actual speeches from the bema. They appeal to ancient testimony that in political debate Demosthenes was accustomed to use harsh and strained language, and that under the pressure of feeling his style became impassioned and unrestrained.¹ Now the *Crown Speech* teaches us abundantly that Demosthenes had command of a style of the widest range. As we read there his coarse attacks on Aeschines, we can imagine what his speech may often have been in the ecclesia, before a roaring crowd of partisans; but in the Marathonian oath of the same speech we see how far high sentiment can carry him above even the most dignified language of the *Philippics*. Every page of the *Crown Speech* testifies to Demosthenes' marvelous appreciation of the adaptation of style to thought. Now the style of the *Philippics*, high as it is, is never higher than their thought.

But Wilamowitz and Wendland raise further objection: they say that such a style as that of the *Philippics*, with its pure vocabulary, its refinements of rhythm, and its rounded periods, is not adapted to an audience like that which faced the Athenian bema. Now waiving the question whether an Athenian audience in an ordinary ecclesia was better fitted to appreciate dignified oratory than the audience would be in a mass meeting of native citizens of Denver or St. Louis or Boston,² I appeal to the never-changing fact that elevated thought, made to live in splendid language, and delivered with the power of a commanding personality, appeals supremely to any people of ordinary intelligence. Lord Brougham

¹ See Aes. III, 72 and 166 f., and Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, ix. In none of this testimony is there any suggestion of vulgarity or coarseness of language. At most we read of a far-fetched use of metaphorical expressions, and a tendency to be carried away by feeling in the excitement of speaking.

² Doubtless we have often exaggerated the intelligence of the mass of the Athenian people; yet their drama testifies to a mental acuteness and to intellectual standards that must be reckoned with in any estimate of what would appeal to them.

speaks with authority here: "A speaker who thinks to lower his composition in order to accommodate himself to the habits and tastes of his audience, when addressing the multitude, will find that he commits a grievous mistake."¹ It is to be remembered, too, that these speeches of Demosthenes at the best show the same vocabulary and style that we find in his court speeches on similar themes; but in court his audience was as really a popular one as on the Pnyx; smaller in size, not more intelligent; less so, if anything.² The dignity and refinement of his style in the elevated parts of his court speeches go far to justify the belief that similar themes were treated in similar style in the ecclesia.

But if the style of these works does offer any difficulty in regarding them as speeches, the difficulty in regarding this as a pamphlet style is very much greater. The style of some would be possible for a pamphlet; but in others we find speech as far as possible removed from what we think of as appropriate to the pamphlet. The advocates of the pamphlet theory meet this objection by saying that these are not ordinary pamphlets, but pamphlets by an orator, designed for oral reading, and cast in the form of speeches; that therefore something of oratorical form is to be expected in them. This explanation would suffice for some of the speeches, especially the earlier ones; but in the later *Philippics* there is a steadily rising tide of oratorical expression. The *Chersonese Speech* and the *Third Philippic* are written in language that demands oratorical delivery; others of these works have the sharp *ὑποφορά*, the rhetorical question, the indignant bursts of feeling, that mark them as intended for the most lively delivery.

But there is a still deeper disagreement between the style of these works and that of the pamphlet. The pamphlet

¹ Brougham, *Dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients*, pp. 41 ff.

² However much the intelligent and well-to-do citizens may have been inclined to shirk attendance on the ecclesia, they certainly took their part in it on occasions of special importance, like some of those that called out Demosthenes' speeches, while we can hardly assume that under any circumstances many men of their class offered themselves for jury duty. We must assume that the average of intelligence in the jury-room was less than in the ecclesia.

makes its appeal to the judgment; that is its very purpose as compared with the speech; the harangue makes its strongest appeal to sentiment. Now in the later Philippic speeches, while there is considerable argumentation, the main effect comes through direct appeal to feeling and passion. On this point I need only recall Lord Brougham's remarks in his essay on Demosthenes (pp. 196 ff.) and his *Dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients* (pp. 50 ff.).

A further argument against regarding the political works of Demosthenes as actual speeches is derived from a comparison with the two extant *δημηγορίαι* of other statesmen, the speech *On the Peace* by Andocides, and the speech *On Halonnesus* by Hegesippus. It is said that these two works have the characteristics of genuine *δημηγορίαι*, and that they stand in marked contrast to the works of Demosthenes in question. I will not insist on the fact that so good a critic as Drerup considers the Andocides speech to be itself a pamphlet,¹ or that Beloch denies the genuineness of the Halonnesus speech.² I will assume that both are genuine *δημηγορίαι*. It is true that in both we find one of the criteria laid down for a typical *δημηγορία*, treatment of a specific question which is the order of the day in the ecclesia, and argument looking toward a definite vote. As regards style each speech has its own characteristics. The Halonnesus speech is not oratorical in form; the speaker tries to be plain and matter of fact. He uses a single coarse expression, "If you carry your brains in your heads and not in your heels" (§ 45); this does remind us that Hegesippus is talking to the "many-headed." But aside from this one expression the language is dignified. Andocides' speech *On the Peace* is decidedly more rhetorical; it is not oratorical, but it shows a command of simple and effective expression, enlivened by repeated *ὑποφορά* and rhetorical question, that testify to a striving after rhetorical effect. In neither of these acknowledged *δημηγορίαι* do we approach the oratorical swing of the *Philippics* of Demosthenes or his variety of rhetorical device

¹ Drerup, [Ἡρώδου] Περὶ Πολιτείας, p. 112.

² Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* II, p. 539, n. 1.

and embellishment. So far as style is concerned it is easier to think of either of these two speeches as a pamphlet than so to conceive of the *Chersonese Speech* or the *Third Philippic*. The difference in style between these speeches and those of Demosthenes is no more than would be expected in the work of any three men of different personality and different rhetorical training.¹

I turn now to positive considerations in favor of the speech theory: 1. In the *Rhodian Speech* (§ 6) Demosthenes himself speaks of the speech *On the Symmories* as having been delivered before the people and approved by them. The reference is so definite and detailed that in any reasonable interpretation we must admit that the speech *On the Symmories* was actually delivered from the bema.

2. Some of the speeches contain expressions that imply the presence of the audience. So far as these occur in the proem, they might, of course, be considered as a part of the fiction of the speech-pamphlet; but some are so incidental as to make that explanation unnatural.

XVI, 22, ταῦθ' ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον ἴσως εἰδότες ἢ γὰρ φοβοῖσθ' ἂν εἰκότως. The reference to Demosthenes' comparative youthfulness suggests the speaker on the bema, in the sight of the audience, not the writer of a pamphlet. I, 8, ὅθ' ἤκομεν Εὐβοεῦσιν βεβροθηκότες καὶ παρήσαν Ἀμφιπολιτῶν Ἰέραξ καὶ Στρατοκλῆς ἐπὶ τουτὶ τὸ βῆμα. The last phrase is an unconscious testimony that these words are for the ecclesia, not for club-room or stoa. So III, 28, ἡ φρασάτω τις ἐμοὶ παρελθών. III, 32 implies speech in the ecclesia, οὐδὲ γὰρ παρρησία περὶ πάντων αἰεὶ παρ' ὑμῖν ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἔγωγ' ὅτι καὶ νῦν γέγονεν θαυμάζω. So V, 15, καὶ μοι μὴ θορυβήσῃ μηδεὶς πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι, and VIII, 32, καί μοι πρὸς θεῶν, ὅταν εἵνεκα τοῦ βελτίστου λέγω, ἔστω παρρησία. In IV, 30, ἃ μὲν ἡμεῖς, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, δεδυνήμεθ' εὐρεῖν ταῦτ' ἐστίν, to the reader of a pamphlet the question who are the ἡμεῖς would have been as puzzling as it is to us, but to the listeners in the ecclesia it was doubtless entirely explained by the circumstances of the discussion.

¹ The attempt to establish from a couple of speeches by inferior orators a norm that is to be applied to the speeches of the master of the bema is itself unsound in method.

3. Another serious objection to the pamphlet theory lies in the incidental and incomplete way in which the subject under discussion is introduced. In the case of a speech the subject is often already before the ecclesia, and need not be stated by the speaker; but the pamphlet in order to be intelligible needs to state its subject clearly at the beginning. The works under discussion seldom do this. One appreciates this fact better by comparing these works with the two pamphlets of Isocrates that are cast in the form of *λόγοι συμβουλευτικοί*, the *Πλαταϊκός* and the speech *Περὶ Εἰρήνης*, in each of which the subject is stated clearly and explicitly early in the speech. The same is true of Lysias' pamphlet *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ καταλύσαι τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν Ἀθήνησι*.

4. In some of the speeches matters are referred to, but left unexplained, which would be entirely intelligible in the speech, but have no meaning in a pamphlet. In iv, 37 a letter is referred to, and the lemma, ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΙΣ is given in the manuscripts, but the text gives nothing to show the content of the letter. If this was a speech, the audience heard the letter read; if it had been originally written as a pamphlet, the letter would have been given, or at least we should have an outline of its contents. The same is true of the missing schedule of revenues in iv, 29. The schedule would be read in the ecclesia; it would have to be given in full in the pamphlet to be of any use to the argument. In vi, 28 Demosthenes says of the answer that he would have the people give to the ambassadors, *ταῦτ' ἤδη λέξω*. But he does not read it here nor in the nine remaining paragraphs of the speech. If this were a pamphlet, we ought to have at least the substance of the proposed answer. If this is a speech, the relation of the document to the text is like that of scores of documents to the text of court speeches of Demosthenes and other pleaders.¹

5. Finally, I am influenced in adhering to the speech-

¹ The original reason for the omission of documents in published court speeches may not have held for speeches delivered in the ecclesia, but the custom of omission having been thoroughly established for legal oratory would naturally pass over to the other.

theory by the fact that it seems to me to offer the best solution of two of the long-standing puzzles of Demosthenic criticism, the problem of the longer and shorter versions of the *Third Philippic*, and the problem of the origin of the *Fourth Philippic*, with its repetition of considerable parts of the *Chersonese Speech*.

The problem of the *Fourth Philippic* entered on a new stage with the discovery of the Didymus commentary. Körte's brilliant article, "Zu Didymos' Demosthenes-Commentar," *Rhein. Mus.* 1905, 388 ff., is a complete demonstration that the speech is by a contemporary of the events, and his argument that it is by Demosthenes himself seems to me almost equally conclusive. My space allows me here only to outline a theory that gives a simple account of the *Third Philippic* in its two forms, and of the *Fourth Philippic*. I offer the following as theses to be defended elsewhere.

1. In a carefully prepared speech on affairs in the Chersonese, Demosthenes combined a defense of Diopithes (the immediate occasion of the speech) with a discussion of the situation in general, and a rousing call to action. As the speech was in part of only momentary interest he did not publish it.

2. Very soon he treated the general situation in a speech of tremendous power, the *Third Philippic*. He soon revised this speech, adding the suggestion that help be sought from Persia; in this revised form he published the speech, for the sake of influencing public opinion both at home and abroad (it has more of general Hellenic consideration than the other Philippics). This is our longer (vulgate) version.

3. On the receipt of the news of the arrest of Hermias by the Persians, Demosthenes became filled with the hope of Persian subsidies. He now delivered a speech in which he held out this hope, showed that under these conditions it might not be necessary to touch the theorika, and deprecated too hasty declaration of war,¹ but urged immediate preparation for it, and made a telling attack on Aristomedes by name.

¹ See Körte's article, cited above.

4. This speech he prepared for publication by combining with it the more general parts of the unpublished *Chersonese Speech* (with some verbal changes). This published speech is our *Fourth Philippic*.

5. After Demosthenes' death the original unpublished manuscript of the speech that Demosthenes had delivered *On the Chersonese* was found among his papers, along with the original manuscript of the *Third Philippic* (the form of the speech as delivered), and both were published by his literary executors. This version of the *Third Philippic* is our shorter version, that of the Ms. Σ.